

Date: Sun, 9 May 93 01:42:29 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #134
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sun, 9 May 93 Volume 93 : Issue 134

Today's Topics:

 amateur operating tests (was: sick of it all)
 Humor Alert
 More on no-code
 no-code defense (3 msgs)
 Novice/Tech Data privileges on 10m (3 msgs)
 sick of it all
 The Canonical list of Code-Wars Answers
What we all agree on - THEORY TESTS THAT MEAN SOMETHING

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 8 May 1993 16:14:21 GMT
From: newsflash.concordia.ca!mizar.cc.umanitoba.ca!mona.muug.mb.ca!
bwalzer@uunet.uu.net
Subject: amateur operating tests (was: sick of it all)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <H.eg.TtlqQLUexBs@harvee.billerica.ma.us> esj@harvee.billerica.ma.us
(Eric S Johansson) writes:

>In reality, you're not too far off. I have always advocated new hams
>should operate for some period of time under the watchful eye of a
>more experienced ham or group of hams. I also advocate that the
>licensing process should include operating under (semi)real conditions
>not unlike a drivers test.

I used to hear this suggestion a lot back in the days I was into CB.

The problem with applying it to amateur radio is that it assumes too much about what the new licensee wants to do with the spectrum they are now allowed to use.

When I heard about the impending Canadian no-code licence I immediately thought "Great, now I can get on the pac-sats". I started to gather up the various bits and pieces to create a 9600 bps pac-sat station. When I could, I dropped down to the local DOC office wrote the basic and advanced (you need to write the advanced test to build transmitters in Canada, I had modded a VHF transmitter strip enough to make me want to play it safe). I managed to communicate with UO-14 a few months later.

Where would I of found a "more experienced ham or group of hams" to check my UO-14 operating skills? I was the first on UO-14 from Canada for heavens sake.

OTOH, I was a bit confused and disapointed about the lack of questions on voice operation on the Canadian basic test. I had to memorise a page of Q signals but did not have to know anything about the phonetic alphabet for example. After all I was taking what I thought was a no-code test. I expected an emphasis on good voice operation.

Bruce Walzer |Voice: (204)783-4983
1312 Valour Rd. |Internet: bwalzer@mona.muug.mb.ca
Winnipeg MB |BBS: (204)783-3617 (Ariel II, 1200,8,N)
R3E 2W8 |AmRadio: VE4XOR
Canada |

Date: Sat, 8 May 1993 17:07:28 GMT
From: amdcad!amdcl2!brian@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Humor Alert
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Coming soon to a newsgroup near you, the Canonical List of
 C O D E W A R S R E S P O N S E S
If you do content kills, you'll almost certainly miss it, but
the header will have the word "canonical" in it if you want to
look for it.

Brian McMinn N5PSS brian@amd.com

Date: Fri, 7 May 1993 23:37:22 EST

From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: More on no-code
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

tbodoh@resdgs1.er.usgs.gov (Tom Bodoh) writes:

> An even better analogy may be assembler language. It is the lowest level
> of computer languages and was almost required for early programmers. Today,
> most programmers don't ever learn assembler - or if they do they soon
> forget it due to disuse. It can be argued that a good programmer will
> EVENTUALLY have to learn assembler in order to really understand computers.
> If
> it was required that all programmers become proficient in assembler before
> being allowed to enter the "brotherhood/sisterhood" of computer programmers -
> the number of programmers would diminish - but that would again keep out
> most of the scumbag PCers.

Bzzzzzt! Bad argument. That's why a base PC today has to have at least
8Mb of RAM, 210Mb of HD space and whole bunch of other crap. Because of
these so-called "High-Level" languages we've got some serious garbage
for software. Just look at Microsoft for a perfect example. :)

```
-----  
Tony Pelliccio kd1nr/ae    "Usenet is like a herd of performing elephants  
*!~*!~*!~*!~*!~*!~*!~* with diarrhea -- massive, difficult to  
system@garlic.sbs.com    redirect, awe-inspiring, entertaining, and a  
----- source of mind-boggling amounts of excrement  
                        when you least expect it." --spaf (1992)
```

Date: Fri, 7 May 1993 23:39:24 EST
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: no-code defense
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

> system@mooch.sbs.com (Christopher Ogren) writes:
>
>>Just listen to two meters and 70 cm. They are a disaster around here.
>>Jamming and intenonal[sic] interference have increased sharply
>>aounrd[sic] here.
>
> Well based upon the abuse you guys at sbs seem to dish out to other
> hams, I can't say that I blame them. I travel a fair amount and
> typically take a dual band rig with me. I've yet to hear these

> problems you speak about. In Chicago I've heard *one* jammer in the
> last 18 months on the FM portions of those bands and none on the
> CW/SSB portions of those bands. Why not take your conversations down
> to the CW portions of those bands. You'll get to use your favorite
> mode of communication and I doubt the jammers will bother you there.
> And if they follow you down there, then I guess it's pretty obvious
> why.

Yes, but have you ever been out here? Have you ever listened to a
repeater in this area for more than an hour? We have.. and we hear the
garbage. As far as CW/SSB on the 2m and 70cm bands... why the hell
should we have to inconvenience ourselves for a bunch of no-code idiots
who think it's cool to hear the repeater courtesy tone, or like to break
into conversations on simplex? Perhaps things are different out there in
Chicago, but out here in Providence it's a whole different world.

> Perhaps if you guys climbed down from your pedestals you might find
> that the earth isn't such a bad place. Isn't that why the gods in
> ancient Greek mythology came down to earth, to see things first hand?
> As far as I can tell, the only thing incentive licensing has done is
> create a class of operators who think they're better than everyone
> else. Must get lonely at the top.

No, it's not such a bad place and the view from up here is f'n
fantastic! And we are better than no-codes. Why you ask? Because we made
the effort to upgrade without bitching and moaning about it. Oh, and
once in awhile we come down too... that's why we run a code net three
times a week to help prepare amateurs for code examinations. :)

> Actually I think these sbs postings are all just flame bait. I
> suspect the amateurs in their listening area have already tuned this
> little clique out so they are looking for another audience to stir
> things up. That's probably why they keep their postings in
> rec.radio.amateur.misc.

Nope, not flame bait. Just the way we feel. And no, we haven't been
tuned out here because we're trying to do something positive about it.
We have no problem with a Codeless Tech who practices good operating
procedure and doesn't whine that he/she can't get onto HF because they
don't know the code. But how many times do I have to repost the same
thing before it sinks through that thick skull of yours?

Tony Pelliccio kd1nr/ae
!!*!*!*!*!*!*!*!*
system@garlic.sbs.com

"Usenet is like a herd of performing elephants
with diarrhea -- massive, difficult to
redirect, awe-inspiring, entertaining, and a
source of mind-boggling amounts of excrement

when you least expect it." --spaf (1992)

Date: Sun, 9 May 1993 00:48:03 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: no-code defense
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc nm1z@anomaly.sbs.com (Christopher Ogren) writes:

>Gee wrong you are there! It was supposed to have been a digital license
>to begin with. But itth[sic] enough[sic] whining and bitching they were granted
>voice privs too. You forget that the "whole" world does not have the no
>code license like the US has.

There are certainly administrations that don't have a no code license, but
a large percentage do. And most of them have at granted at least the
privileges that the US has granted. Some such as Japan have granted more.

>Well as I was away at college I was not privy to the fact of that NPRM.
>would have certainly responded in a negative fashion. It should only be
>amateur radio operators who are allowed to respond to NPRM's concerning
>amateur radio. I am sure W5YI and the ARRL pushed hard for people to
>right[sic] in in a positive way. (This has been convered[sic] before).

What brilliant net logic. So the only individuals that can comment or
perhaps even vote(?) on an issue are those licensed in the area? I guess
Rhode Island has a different U.S. Constitution than the rest of the states.
Using your logic, the only people that could comment on traffic law changes
would be licensed drivers, and the only ones that could comment on FAA
regulations are licensed pilots. Well if that were the case, who'd be
allowed to comment on an area where licensing was just being started, no
one??? What utter nonsense.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Sun, 9 May 1993 00:47:57 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: no-code defense
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

>

>>I travel a fair amount and
>>typically take a dual band rig with me. I've yet to hear these
>>problems you speak about.

>Obviously you don't visit Rhode dYland[sic] all that much.

Fortunately for me. Otherwise I might have to listen to the drivel of your followers. Perhaps the Reverend Deignan could take his band of misfits to Waco TX, and try for a second coming. Gosh, I wish I could have such a dedicated following. Will they commit suicide for you too?

>For one reason, it is difficult to convey as much information via CW
>in the same amount of time that you can via voice.

Strange, others have stated that it is conversational in nature. Certainly at the speeds that the elite members of the Rhode Island 2x2 Amateur Repeater Association must be able to copy.

>>As far as I can tell, the only thing incentive licensing has done is
>>create a class of operators who think they're better than everyone
>>else.

>

>But, we are. That's why we're in the Rhode Island 2x2 Amateur Repeater
>Association, and you are not. Unless, of course, you wish to pay the
>\$4,000 no-code membership fee, submit the 5,000 word essay on why you
>want to be a member, and take the 100 question oral examination on
>license-class relevant information from Part 97 and the ARRL
>handbook.

This is great. I love it. Join a repeater association in Rhode Island with you guys as members? I don't think you could *PAY* anyone \$4,000 to join.

>But, as is consistent with your type, I'm sure you just memorized the
>question pools, and really don't remember all that much about "theory"
>anyway...

OH wow, what a cut. I'm bleeding from your rapier wit.

>>That's probably why they keep their postings in
>>rec.radio.amateur.misc.

>

>No, just that .policy is a bandwidth deadzone.

Yeah besides, that would be a demonstration of common courtesy and you wouldn't want to do that. You even put the follow up as

rec.radio.amateur.misc. How kind.

Great arguments. I haven't had this difficult a time debating a topic since I was in second grade.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Fri, 07 May 93 16:38:27 CDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!
robert@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Novice/Tech Data privileges on 10m
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

a-kevinp@microsoft.COM (Kevin Purcell, Rho) writes:

> I read something in a recent Radio Fun column by KA1BUM (?) talking
> about RTTY and Amtor -- the usual explanation then he said you needed
> a General class license or above to use RTTY/Amtor on HF. This jangled
> with a couple of other things I had heard so I went to my copy of Part 97.
>
> So I looked up 97.301 (e). OK no frequency sharing requirements on 10m.
>
> Then I looked at 97.505(c). Two entries apply:
>
> Band Freqs Modes Standard see 97.307(f)
> 10m 28.0 to 28.3 RTTY, Data (4)
> 10m 28.3 to 28.5 Phone, Image (1), (2) and (10)
>
> 97.307(f)
>
> (4) RTTY limited to less than 1200 baud and 1kHz shift
>
> (1) No angle modulated emission with modulation index > 1
>
> (2) No none phone emission shall be no wider than a phone emission
>
> (10) A station holding a Novice or Technician Class operator license
> may only transmit CW emission using the international morse code or
> phone emissions J3E or R3E.
>
> So it strikes me as some people are taking 97.307(f)(10) to mean you
> can only use CW/SSB on 10m if you are a novice/tech. But this is only
> half the truth as the rules really let you use 28.1 to 28.3 for RTTY,

> Amtor, Pactor, Packet etc in addition to CW. The comment in Radio Fun
> is inaccurate.
>
> This also explains why the HTX-100 has mike connections that make it
> easy to attach to TNC or multi-mode controller.
>
> Kevin Purcell N7WIM / G8UDP
> a-kevinp@microsoft.com
> "We conjure the spirits of the computer with our spells"

Read 97.307(f)(10) again. Those are the OPERATOR privileges. Novice and Technician class operators may only use A1A (CW) and J3E/R3E (Phone) emissions, according to the accepted band plan. In other words, other emissions (specifically RTTY) MAY be permitted, but without the correct class of license, they're off limits to you. Radioteletype is also permitted in the Novice/Tech portions of the 80, 40 and 15 meter bands, however those below General are limited to CW only. Check with the FCC.

-Robert WA3J

Date: 8 May 1993 17:47:38 GMT
From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Novice/Tech Data privileges on 10m
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> You are correct, Novice and Technicians (with HF privileges) are authorized
> to use all the digital modes that are authorized to higher class licensees
> on 10m.

Sorry, incorrect. Limitation (10) limits emission type to CW (using morse code) and phone using J3E and R3E.

-Ron

Date: Sun, 9 May 1993 00:47:50 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Novice/Tech Data privileges on 10m
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Well the ARRL publications that list operating privileges for the amateur bands such as the Operating Manual and the Handbook for Radio Amateurs state that novices and technicians with HF privileges can operate CW, RTTY, and data in the 28,100 - 28,300 kHz portion of the 10 meter band. In other words, they have the exact same privileges in that portion of the band as

do extra, advanced, and general call licensees have (other than power).

The ARRL isn't the FCC, but I believe it's highly unlikely that they'd publish operating privilege information that wasn't consistent with the FCC interpretation of Part 97.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Fri, 7 May 1993 23:27:23 EST
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: sick of it all
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

> Some may seek change because they don't want to put in the effort. I put
> in the effort and I still want to see the change as I want prospective hams
> to put the effort into something that serves the purpose of the amateur
> service. How can that be whining? I see extra's posting in favor of
> change. I guess they're whining too.

No, it's not whining.. it's making up for an something that was done to
amateurs by the ARRL.

> Also, this denigrating of the US population is rather humorous.
> Practically every other country had no-code licenses before the US and I
> suspect that they'll have reduced or eliminated code requirements long
> before the US too. Must be they have louder whiners.

Practically every other country? I don't think so. Their no-code
licenses are restricted far better than what the U.S. did. It's a shame,
the no-code license was originally pushed through as a digital license
and people have brought up the argument that the QCWA, TAPR and other
organizations supported it. Of course they did, it meant more money for
them!

> But I guess that wouldn't explain why they have written exams that don't
> have questions like:

>
> What is the purpose of a climbing belt?
>
> A) To hold up your pants
> B)...

>

> Why bother with a written exam if you aren't going to test anything other than
> test taking skills? So you're right, if you aren't willing to make the
> written exams difficult enough to require some studying, eliminate them
> too. They're just an administrative hassle serving no purpose. (Although
> at least the written exams are more relevant to the privileges granted.)

Now that I can agree with. We don't concentrate too much on the safety issue. I mean look at the idiot who posted awhile back about his cat who used to sleep near an antenna putting out a 1KW. Then he wondered why the cat was walking funny.

> It's funny that the EEOC and courts went out of their way to eliminate
> capricious and irrelevant testing for the purposes of employment, yet the
> FCC apparently feels that those are valuable attributes for its testing
> efforts. Strange too that the FCC move to this absurd "incentive"
> licensing structure occurred about the same time employment testing and
> selection became really popular. The EEOC saw the absurdity of it, but I
> guess they never let the FCC know about it.

Having been fully EEOC trained I can say it's mostly a crock. Then again, anything government sticks its nose into is a crock. Besides, it has nothing to do with amateur radio. Prove to me how EEOC applies to amateur radio. We don't discriminate based upon race, color, sex, handicap, etc, or any of the other things EEOC mentions. But since they don't mention morse code... you're pretty well screwed. So think before you post.

> If you want incentive licensing, then incite amateurs to learn something
> that serves the purposes of the amateur service and not the whims of the
> intransigent few.

Yipppee!!!! Can't wait to get my General Radiotelephone. :)

Tony Pelliccio kd1nr/ae
!!*!*!*!*!*!*!*!*
system@garlic.sbs.com

"Usenet is like a herd of performing elephants with diarrhea -- massive, difficult to redirect, awe-inspiring, entertaining, and a source of mind-boggling amounts of excrement when you least expect it." --spaf (1992)

Date: Sat, 8 May 1993 17:11:14 GMT
From: amdcad!amdcl2!brian@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: The Canonical list of Code-Wars Answers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

To Code or Not To Code, *THAT* is the question! I've collected and distilled the *ENTIRE* net.wisdom on this issue and so I present the following canonical list for your elucidation. In order to conserve net.bandwidth, please search for your favorite answer and then respond by number rather than with the entire text. :-)

Brian McMinn N5PSS brian.mcminn@amd.com

- 1) No-Code is good!
- 2) No-Code is bad!
- 3) Morse Code is a separate and distinct *LANGUAGE*!
- 4) No it isn't!
- 5) Yes it is! I just talked to a guy in Upper Eeleeouglieaph yesterday. His name was Dzlaeuflinaout and that's all I know!
- 6) Everybody should know Morse Code to help intercept *SPY* messages!
- 7) Hey! Morse is my favorite mode! Don't knock it 'till you try it!
- 8) Morris Code stinks!
- 9) No it doesn't!
- 10) It's the most spectrally *efficient* mode!
- 11) No it isn't!
- 12) Code will punch through when all else fails because it has the *BEST* immunity to noise!
- 13) No way! Digital modes and DSP will pull a signal out of the noise when you can't *EVEN* hear it!
- 14) I've got better things to do with my brain cells than ask them to act like a wetware modem!
- 15) I had to learn Morse Code so *YOU* should too!
- 16) All past and current problems with ham radio are a direct result of the No-Code Technicians!
- 17) Morse Code keeps the riff-raff out of ham radio!
- 18) Toss the Code requirement and make the written test harder!
- 19) Can I order pizza in Morse Code?
- 20) I heard one of those bozo's sending Morse Code on the repeater!
- 21) If Morris Code is so good, why does it need protected band space?
- 22) The FCC says No-Code is good. So There!
- 23) I wouldn't be a ham if there wasn't a No-Code license.
- 24) GET A LIFE!
- 25) Where's my KILL file?
- 26) That's the sound of an electric hole saw warming up!
- 27) The ARRL did this to us! Blame *THEM*!
- 28) The ARRL tried their best to stop this! Blame *THEM*!
- 29) I'm going to cancel my ARRL membership over this *ONE* issue!
- 30) Hams who started with No-Code now represent 98% of all hams!
- 31) Hey! Can't you U.S. guys keep this discussion to yourselves?
- 32) You're a *#&@!^%!
- 33) Yeah? And your mother wears tennis shoes!
- 34) Oh bother, let's just give the spectrum back to the spectrum gods.
- 35) Vacuum Tubes! Yeah, now that's a great idea!

36) I can build a CW transceiver with only *THREE* components!
37) Including the *ANTENNA*!
38) Without Morse Code, the ham bands will be filled with *CB'ers*!
39) UGH!
40) Hey! Who're you calling a *CB'er*!
41) (in chorus) UGH!
42) Free the airwaves! Eliminate the written test!
43) Sigh. Another step in the &#x\$*%)# incentive licensing scandal.
44) The QCWA supported No-Code, so it must be good!
45) It's a conspiracy of the {ARRL, QCWA, AMSAT, TAPR, \$\$\$\$, etc.}
46) This discussion is *BORING*!
47) *EVERYBODY* supports No-Code!
48) *EVERYBODY* hates No-Code!
49) Morse Code is a *VALUABLE* skill!
50) There's an *INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT* that forbids this!
51) But Japan doesn't abide by it!
52) Morse Code -- it's *DIVINE*!
53) *FLAMETHROWERS ON HIGH*!
54) Go ahead, I've got my asbestos underwear on!
55) Ya feel lucky, Punk? Huh? Go ahead, make my day.
56) Take this discussion to r.r.a.policy!

Date: Sun, 09 May 1993 07:41:06 GMT
From: nevada.edu!jimi!physics.unr.edu!nimbus!mswmod@uunet.uu.net
Subject: What we all agree on - THEORY TESTS THAT MEAN SOMETHING
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

OK, now that you have opened up this can of worms, lets see
if you can "make" a test that is better than what we now
have and that most will agree with.

I would like to see the test mean more than they do now, but
haven't been able to come up with a good way to do it.

Have fun, Ron KU7Y

Date: Sun, 09 May 1993 07:47:01 GMT
From: nevada.edu!jimi!physics.unr.edu!nimbus!mswmod@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <N4HY.93May6065206@growler.ccr-p.ida.org>,
<1993May6.170713.1600@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<930507.232723.7q6.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>
Subject : Re: sick of it all

In article <930507.232723.7q6.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com> system@garlic.sbs.com
(Anthony S. Pelliccio) writes:

>little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

>

>

>> It's funny that the EEOC and courts went out of their way to eliminate
>> capricious and irrelevant testing for the purposes of employment, yet the
>> FCC apparently feels that those are valuable attributes for its testing
>> efforts.

>> Strange too that the FCC move to this absurd "incentive"
>> licensing structure occurred about the same time employment testing and
>> selection became really popular. The EEOC saw the absurdity of it, but I
>> guess they never let the FCC know about it.

Incentive licensing was here in 1953 when I got my ticket. It was
dropped for awhile and then brought back in. I really don't think
the EEOC was doing its thing back then.

>

>Yipppee!!!! Can't wait to get my General Radiotelephone. :)

>

Yep, have that too. Now what?

73s & cul, Ron KU7Y

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #134
